



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,978	05/25/2001	Masood Mortazavi	SUN1P820/P5884	6345

22434 7590 11/21/2003

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 778
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778

EXAMINER

MOSLEHI, FARHOOD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/865,978

Applicant(s)

MORTAZAVI ET AL.

Examiner

Farhood Moslehi

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 2126

1. Claims 1-44 are presented for examination.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

3. Claims 1,3-8,10,12-16,18-23,25,27-31,33-38,40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by iPlanet Application Server 6.0 White Paper, Technical Reference Guide, Sun Microsystems, May 25,2000 (hereinafter Sun).
4. As per claim 1, Sun teaches a computer-implemented method for a first component to invoke a second component asynchronously in an object-oriented computing environment, the computer-implemented method comprising: receiving a request from a first component to invoke a second component (e.g. page 23, iPlanet Application Server diagram); maintaining the scope of the received request (page 23, lines 1-5); providing a thread for identifying the received request and invoking the second component, wherein the thread identifies an exception listener for handling exceptions associated with the invocation of the second component (page 26, lines 1-15).
5. As per claim 10, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
6. As per claim 16, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2126

7. As per claim 25, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
8. As per claim 31, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
9. As per claim 38, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
10. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
11. As per claim 44, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
12. As per claim 3, Sun shows a computer-implemented method wherein the request is associated with no application specific exceptions (e.g. page 91, "Enterprise Connectors").
13. As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
14. As per claim 18, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
15. As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
16. As per claim 33, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
17. As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
18. As per claim 4, Sun shows the computer-implemented method wherein the first and second components are associated with separate servers (e.g. page 9, "improved Performance, Scalability and Reliability").
19. As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
20. As per claim 19, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
21. As per claim 28, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
22. As per claim 34, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.
23. As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2126

24. As per claim 5, Sun teaches the computer-method wherein the first and second components are Enterprise Java Bean components (e.g. page 12, "Application Model").

The Application components are clearly marked as Enterprise JavaBeans.

25. As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

26. As per claim 20, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

27. As per claim 29, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

28. As per claim 35, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

29. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

30. As per claim 6, Sun, demonstrates the computer-implemented method, wherein the first and second components are associated with a container (e.g. page 28, "Services Hosted by KJS Only", EJB container).

31. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

32. As per claim 21, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

33. As per claim 30, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

34. As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

35. As per claim 7, Sun clearly shows the computer-implemented method, further comprising placing the request from the first component is placed in a queue (e.g. page 26, lines 1-11).

36. As per claim 22, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

37. As per claim 8, Sun clearly shows the computer-implemented method, wherein the worker thread dequeues the received request after receiving a transaction commit signal from the container (e.g. page 44, "How the Servlet Engine Allocates Resources").

Art Unit: 2126

38. As per claim 23, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

39. As per claim 37, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

40. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

41. Claims 2,11,17,26,32,39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Katrina E. Kerry Falkner et al., Implementing Asynchronous Remote Method Invocation in Java, July 2, 1999 (hereinafter Falkner).

42. As per claim 2, Sun does not specifically show a computer-implemented method wherein the request has a return type of void. Falkner clearly shows computer-implemented method wherein the request has a return type of void (e.g. page 4, "package ServerTests", Asynch1 method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun with Falkner. The motivation would have been to invoke a component without returning any value; hence using a void return type.

43. As per claim 17, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

44. As per claim 32, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

45. As per claim 39, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Art Unit: 2126

46. As per claim 11, Sun does not specifically show a computer-implemented method wherein the asynchronous proxy has the same type as the second component. Falkner clearly shows a computer-implemented method wherein the asynchronous proxy has the same type as the second component (e.g. page 4, "package ServerTests", Asynch1 method). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun with Falkner. The motivation would have been to invoke a component asynchronously without returning any value; hence using a void return type.

47. As per claim 26, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

48. Claims 9 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun in view of Falkner as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Sun Microsystems, Java Message Service, November 9, 1999 (hereinafter Sun Microsystems).

49. As per claim 9, Sun even when combined with Falkner do not specifically show the computer-implemented method wherein the exception listener receives the exception and the scope of the exception. Sun Microsystems clearly teaches the computer-implemented method wherein the exception listener receives the exception and the scope of the exception (e.g. page 54, "ExceptionListener"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sun, Falkner and Sun Microsystems. The motivation would have been to set up a listener that acts as a trap server to receive all exceptions from components that are sending exception messages.

Art Unit: 2126

50. As per claim 24, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

Conclusion

51. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Patent Number US 6,292,933 to Bahrs et al.

Patent Number US 6,230,160 to Chan et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Farhood Moslehi whose telephone number is 703-305-8646. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 703-305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-5484.

fm



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**